



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/668,421	09/22/2000	Mohan Ananda	81045.913D3	2663
22804 7590 04/22/2009 THE HECKER LAW GROUP 1925 CENTURY PARK EAST SUITE 2300 LOS ANGELES, CA 90067				
EXAMINER SHERR, CRISTINA O				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3685				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/22/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/668,421

Applicant(s)

ANANDA, MOHAN

Examiner

CRISTINA OWEN SHERR

Art Unit

3685

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 January 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 198, 203, 204, 213, 214, 216, 219, 220, 222, 223 and 241-243 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 198, 203, 204, 213, 214, 216, 219, 220, 222, 223 and 241-243 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/22/2009
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to applicant's amendment filed January 27, 2009. Claims 198, 203, 204, 213, 214, 216, 219, 220, 222, 223, and 241-243 are currently pending in this case.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on September 22, 2000 are being considered by the examiner.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed January 27, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

4. Applicant argues, regarding claims 198 and 226 that nothing in the cited prior art discloses, teaches or suggests a server system configured to continue verifying authentication over time.

5. Examiner respectfully disagrees and directs attention first to Whitehouse reciting a "postage indicium request validation procedure" (col 8 ln 34-38), and later, a "zip+4 procedure for generating a . . .value for each destination address" (col 8 ln 42-46), and eventually " . . .destination address is validated and a . . .value is generated for the destination address"(col 12 ln 65-67), where the said ZIP is part of the indicium generated (col 13 ln 25-35).

6. Attention is now directed to Cordery wherein "address hygiene may involve multiple communications between the mailer and the address hygiene data base" (col 9 ln 19-22). Note also that the mailer may "defer the processing of particular mailpieces

requiring multiple communications" (col 9 ln 33-38), thus terminating the transaction with respect to those mailpieces. Also, "uncorrected addresses can be outsourced from a mail run . . ." (col 9 ln 40), thus terminating the transaction with respect to those mailpieces.

7. Thus, the combination of Whitehouse and Cordery leads to verifying address as part of authentication information repeatedly and terminating or interrupting the transaction with respect to those mailpieces where the address/authentication information is not validated.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 198, 213, 214, 216, 219, 220, and 241-243 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitehouse (US 6,005,945) in view of Cordery et al (US 5,454,038).

10. Regarding claim 198 –

11. Whitehouse discloses a system for transferring items having value in a computer network (see, e.g., abs) comprising:

a plurality of user terminals coupled to a computer network (e.g. fig 4 and assoc. text, col 7 ln 54-col 8 ln 3);

a database system coupled to said network and remote from said plurality of user terminals for storing information about one or more users using said plurality of user terminals (e.g. col 10, ln 45-col 11 ln 29) ; and

a server system coupled to said network, said server system comprising:
cryptographic capabilities for transferring an item having value to a user terminal issuing a specific request for said item having value utilizing said information stored in said database system (col 7 ln 54- col 8 ln 63, col 27, ln 9-28, col 12 ln 16-26).

12. Whitehouse, does not specifically disclose, but Cordery does, wherein said server system is configured to continue verifying authentication of said specific request over time while said item having value is transferred to said user terminal and wherein said user terminal is configured to terminate said transfer of said item having value if said authentication fails while said transfer is taking place, said authentication comprising the exchange of a non-predetermined pseudo random number parameter created specifically for said specific request. (e.g. col 9 ln 33- col 10 ln 39). Note that, as above, Cordery recites that "address hygiene may involve multiple communications between the mailer and the address hygiene data base" (col 9 ln 19-22). As above, "address hygiene may involve multiple communications between the mailer and the address hygiene data base" (col 9 ln 19-22). Note also that the mailer may "defer the processing of particular mailpieces requiring multiple communications" (col 9 ln 33-38), thus terminating the transaction with respect to those mailpieces. Also, "uncorrected

addresses can be outsourced from a mail run . . ." (col 9 ln 40), thus terminating the transaction with respect to those mailpieces.

13. It would have been obvious, therefore, to a practitioner of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the authentication step of Cordery as well as the encryption/decryption method to that of Whitehouse for further enhancing the security of the communication in addition to better prevention of unauthorized requests as well as securing the storage of the data within the database using secret keys.

14. Regarding claims 213-214, 241-243 –

15. Whitehouse discloses as previously discussed. The system of claim 198, wherein said cryptographic capabilities comprise a cryptographic device that protects data using a stored secret or password. (e.g., col. 4, line 55-col. 7, line 15).

16. Regarding claim 216 –

17. Whitehouse discloses a method for secure processing of items having value in a computer network comprising a plurality of user terminals (see, e.g., abs) comprising:

storing information about one or more users using a plurality of user terminals in a database system coupled to a network and remote from said plurality of user terminals(e.g. fig 4 and assoc. text, col 7 ln 54-col 8 ln 3, col 10, ln 45-col 11 ln 29); and
performing secure functions for an item having value in response to a specific request from a user terminal utilizing said information stored in said database system to execute cryptographic capabilities remote from user terminal(col 7 ln 54- col 8 ln 63, col 27, ln 9-28, col 12 ln 16-26).

18. Whitehouse, does not specifically disclose, but Cordery does continuing to verify authentication over time during performance of said secure functions for said item having value; and terminating said performance of secure functions for said item having value if said authentication fails while said secure functions are being performed, said authentication comprising the exchange of a non-predetermined pseudo random number parameter created specifically for said specific request. (e.g. col 9 In 33- col 10 In 39). Note that, as above, Cordery recites that "address hygiene may involve multiple communications between the mailer and the address hygiene data base" (col 9 In 19-22). As above, "address hygiene may involve multiple communications between the mailer and the address hygiene data base" (col 9 In 19-22). Note also that the mailer may "defer the processing of particular mailpieces requiring multiple communications" (col 9 In 33-38), thus terminating the transaction with respect to those mailpieces. Also, "uncorrected addresses can be outsorted from a mail run . . ." (col 9 In 40), thus terminating the transaction with respect to those mailpieces.

19. It would have been obvious, therefore, to a practitioner of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the authentication step of Cordery as well as the encryption/decryption method to that of Whitehouse for further enhancing the security of the communication in addition to better prevention of unauthorized requests as well as securing the storage of the data within the database using secret keys.

20. Regarding claim 219 -

21. Cordery discloses authenticating the identity of a user. (e.g. col 9 In 33- col 10 In 39).

22. Regarding claim 220 –
23. Cordery discloses verifying that the authenticated user is authorized to print said item having value. (e.g. col 10 ln 40-45).
24. Claims 203-204, 222-223 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitehouse (US 6,005,945) in view of Cordery et al (US 5,454,038) further in view of Kara (US 5,822,739).
25. Whitehouse discloses as previously disclosed.
26. Regarding claims 203-204, 222-223 –
27. Cordery discloses:
- a database that comprises data for creating indicia, account maintenance, and revenue protection (e.g., col. 6, lines 49-53)
 - where the value-bearing item is a mail-piece (e.g., postage for mail)
 - where the cryptographic device generates a digital signature (e.g. signature = token, abs, fig. 4,(414) , col 2 ln 63- col 3 ln 3, col 6 ln 55 – col 7 ln 8).
 - where the cryptographic device encrypts the request information (col. 3, line 65- col. 4, line 3, col. 6, lines 49-53).
- 28.** Kara discloses that the server (e.g., the Meter program) verifies whether the proper funding is available for the transaction requested by the user (e.g. col. 13, lines 31-45). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ a plurality of postal security device data (e.g., prepaid postage credit) stored in the database for ensuring authenticity or authority of each user (e.g., to prevent fraud by

unauthorized users), wherein each postal security device data is related to one of the users and the postal security device data related to the one of the users is loaded into

29. the cryptographic device when one of the users requests to print a value-bearing item (e.g., to prevent fraud by unauthorized users).

30. Further, Cordery does not explicitly disclose the claimed public and private keys. However, as shown by Kara (e.g., col. 10, lines 18-29), the claimed public/private key feature is well-known encryption method in the art.

31. Examiner's note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may be applied as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Conclusion

32. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

33. Le Carpentier (US 4,752,950) discloses a remote control system for franking machines.

34. Lee (US 5,657,698) discloses a franking machine system.

35. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

36. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

37. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **CRISTINA OWEN SHERR** whose telephone number is (571)272-6711. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 Monday through Friday.

38. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Calvin L. Hewitt, II can be reached on (571)272-6709. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

39. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CRISTINA OWEN SHERR
Examiner
Art Unit 3685

/Calvin L Hewitt II/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3685